

City of San José
Coyote Valley Specific Plan

DRAFT
Summary of Community Meeting
February 7, 2008
Coyote Creek Golf Club

Task Force Member Present

Chuck Butters, and Ken Saso.

Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Members Present

Mike Griffis (Santa Clara Co Roads & Airport), and Kerry William (CHG).

City and Other Public Agencies Staff Present

Jessica Garcia-Kohl (Mayor's office), Wayne Chen (Housing), Salifu Yakubu (PBCE), Susan Walsh (PBCE), Darryl Boyd (PBCE), Jared Hart (PBCE), Perihan Ozdemir (PBCE), and Regina Mancera (PBCE).

Consultants Present

Doug Dahlin (Dahlin Group), Yasmin Farazian (Ken Kay Associates), Eileen Goodwin (APEX Strategies), Jim Musbach (EPS), and Bill Wagner (HMH),

Community Members Present (Additional people were present; however, the names below only reflect individuals who identified themselves on the sign-up sheet.)

Annie Saso, Consuelo Crosby, Joe Crosby, Al Victors, Peter Rothschild, Susan Orth, Justin Fields, Kiley Russell, Jack & Marley Spilman, Mike Carr, Chris Roberts, Steve C, Donna, James Fan, Mark Anthony Medeiros, Michael Tallerra, Paul Turner, Chris Trnebridge, Marshall Torre, Jeremy Barousse, Ji A, Tony, Julie, Lailo, Susan Fan, and David Marsland.

1. Welcome and Introductions

Eileen Goodwin, with APEX Strategies, welcomed everyone to the meeting. A show of hands revealed there was a mix of people both familiar with and new to the CVSP.

2. Agenda Review

Eileen reviewed the meeting agenda, and indicated there would be opportunities for public comments at the end of the presentation. She explained that the gold comment card is to provide comments.

3. Plan Refinements Concepts

Sal Yakubu, Principal Planner with the City of San Jose Planning, Building and Code Enforcement Department, Doug Dahlin, with Dahlin Group and Yasmin Farazian, with Ken Kay Associates

4. Community Comments and Questions about the CVSP Draft EIR

The community provided the following questions and comments:

- Support the idea of the lake as a center focal point. It sounds like the lake is being changed to move plan along more quickly. It makes the plan less appealing. Why isn't there a big park around the lake that people could enjoy and walk to? It's important to maintain the beauty and tranquility of Coyote Valley. A more rural plan would make more sense than a high density plan. Would like the plan to be bike-friendly. Would like to have a regional park to be placed in Coyote Valley. *Doug explained the CVSP parks concept, highlighting the International Park, Coyote Creek and Fisher Creek corridors, ball fields, trails, the Central Commons and the neighborhood parks within a 5 minute walk to most residents. He explained how Concept #1 refinements recognize the reality of fully entitled projects, and they are working with landowners while still trying to maintain the Coyote Valley Vision.*
- Is Concept 3 the fall back and addresses landowner's demands to acknowledge all of their entitlements? *Doug indicated it is a concept that works if implementation of the Plan is significantly delayed and other entitled development moves forward. Concept 3 recognizes current entitlements west of the lake, and provides more workplace use. The office around the lake could be beneficial.*
- Is there anything in plan refinements that includes a wildlife corridor? If you are not including the wildlife corridor it is not environmentally friendly or sustainable. In reality this plan should have died a long time ago. Don't understand how after thousands of comments on EIR we are still on the same track with this Plan. Infill and redevelopment should come first before development of Coyote Valley. *Darryl Boyd, Principal Planner, with the City of San Jose Planning, Building and Code Enforcement Department indicated that another*

effort currently underway is the habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) and there has been a lot of discussion regarding the wildlife corridor included in HCP process. A lot of new information regarding the wildlife corridor came in right before previous EIR was released. The City will go back and look at all of the new information, meet with people who have new data and analyze new data for the revised EIR. We still don't know how viable this wildlife corridor is. The HCP has identified multiple wildlife corridors in the County.

- Eileen asked for clarification regarding the Program level versus the Project level EIR. *Darryl indicated that the City is now preparing a program level EIR for the CVSP, which will not allow any construction. Subsequent environmental review will need to be done at a later date, prior to construction. The Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) has agricultural mitigation policies that will need to be addressed (mitigation for conversion of prime farmlands). A program level EIR deals with issues at the General Plan level, and a project level EIR deals with allowing physical development and ground disturbance. There will need to be project level EIR later on.*
- It will cost more to break up high schools. Has Gavilan expressed interest in sharing costs? *Yes. Doug indicated that there have been some good discussions between the Morgan Hill Unified School District and Gavilan College, and they are planning for shared facilities.*
- Why did you put industrial east of Monterey Road? Why not put parks there instead? It does not seem harmonious to put residential adjacent to workplace use. *Yasmine indicated that the workplace use was intended to be a buffer between the freeway "fly over" and the residential use.*
- Are expensive homes going to be facing Palm Avenue or are the backsides of the homes going to face Palm Avenue? *Doug indicated the homes would be facing Palm Avenue.*
- You are isolating the Greenbelt property owners, and I don't want to feel isolated.
- How will the Plan respect ecology? The City is not cooperating with HCP effort. The wildlife corridor has been basically left out of plan. To be environmentally-friendly the plan needs more parks and a wildlife corridor. Some of the property owner's questions are never answered.
- There is not much difference between Concept 1 and Concept 1b? *Sal indicated that they are very similar.*
- Disagree with the plan refinements since there has never been an option to not develop in Coyote Valley. People who do not want to develop Coyote Valley are not being listened to. Their ideas are never presented as an option.
- Plan needs to look at flooding. There have been serious flooding problems with flooding in the Downtown area and in this area. Anderson reservoir overflows in large storm events.
- If the motivation for plan refinements is not the "faulty; EIR" then why not? *Sal indicated that the City is obligated to respond to comments on the Plan, some EIR comments and to ensure that the Plan can be implemented and is financially feasible. These are the primary reasons for the plan refinements.*
- How do the plan refinements relate to the negative EIR comments that you received? *Darryl indicated that the plan refinements are not focused on EIR comments. There are many land use plan changes that are necessary to ensure that the plan can be implemented.*
- Comments about the lake show that there is environmental negligence.
- Sierra club is against development of this plan. It needs to be refined greatly and scaled back. The plan as is will not be accepted by current City Council. The plan does not

address the significant wildlife corridor issues. Vehicle trips from plan will destroy serpentine soils and habitat.

- Elementary students these days don't get a chance to see wildlife and animals much any more and this plan will ensure that this trend continues.
- There have been a lot of high density developments going in around my area and I have not been receiving any public notices for it.

5. Review of Next Steps in DEIR Process

Sal Yakubu explained the next steps in the process, and indicated that the Task Force meeting schedule and work program are in the packets.

6. Adjourn

Eileen Goodwin thanked everyone for coming to the Community Meeting.

Eileen adjourned the meeting at approximately 8:30 p.m.